

HISTORICAL ESSAYS.

BY

EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A., HON. D.C.L. & LL.D.,

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD;
HONORARY MEMBER OF THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY OF SAINT PETERSBURG.

Ἄνδρες Ρωμαῖοι, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ Ἑλλῆνες καὶ βάρβαροι πάντες.

JOHN KANTAKOUZÉNOS, iii. 3.

THIRD SERIES.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1879.

[The Right of Translation and Reproduction is reserved.]

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF ROME (<i>International Review</i> , May 1874) .. | 1 |
| THE ILLYRIAN EMPERORS AND THEIR LAND (<i>British Quarterly Review</i> , July 1876). | 22 |
| Appendix— <i>Diocletian's Place in Architectural History (Saturday Review, January 8, 1876)</i> | 61 |
| AUGUSTA TREVERORUM (<i>British Quarterly Review</i> , July 1875) .. | 68 |
| Appendix— <i>The Panegyrists of the Fourth Century (Saturday Review, October 4, 1873)</i> | 117 |
| THE GOTHS AT RAVENNA (<i>British Quarterly Review</i> , October 1872) | 121 |
| RACE AND LANGUAGE (<i>Contemporary Review</i> , February 1877, and <i>Fortnightly Review</i> , January 1877) | 173 |
| Appendix— <i>The Jews in Europe (Saturday Review, February 10, 1877)</i> | 226 |
| THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE (<i>North British Review</i> , February 1855, and <i>Saturday Review</i> , November 4, 1876) | 231 |
| FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF ATHENS (<i>International Review</i> , January 1878) | 278 |
| MEDIEVAL AND MODERN GREECE (<i>Edinburgh Review</i> , April 1856; <i>National Review</i> , January 1864; <i>British Quarterly Review</i> , July 1878) | 303 |
| THE SOUTHERN SLAVES (<i>British Quarterly Review</i> , July 1877) .. | 379 |
| SICILIAN CYCLES (<i>Saturday Review</i> , March 9, 1878) | 428 |
| THE NORMANS AT PALERMO (<i>British Quarterly Review</i> , April 1879) | 437 |

IX.

THE SOUTHERN SLAVES.

IN a former essay the attempt was made to trace out the true meaning and the true bounds both of the doctrine of nationality and of its wider developement, the doctrine of race. It was there pointed out that the events of our own day have brought these doctrines into a prominence which they never had before, and had moreover brought them into the closest connexion with the great political changes of our time. It was further implied that the feeling of race in the modern sense, race, as we have defined it elsewhere, race, as distinguished from the narrower feeling of nationality, is chiefly confined to one of the great branches of the European family. The feeling of nationality is strong enough in other cases. That feeling has, within the last twenty years, built up two of the great powers of Europe. It has given the world an united Italy and an united Germany. And it may be as well to remember that, as the wider doctrine of race is made a matter of mockery now, so the narrower doctrine of nationality was, only a few years back, made an equal matter of mockery. We were told that an united Germany and an united Italy were mere dreams of enthusiasts, dreams which lay as far out of the range of practical politics as any dreams of Slavonic enthusiasts can lie now. But united Germany and united Italy now stand before us, not as dreams, but as facts, in the face of all Europe. The reunion of both lands was a strictly national reunion. It did not come within the range of the wider doctrine of race. Whenever the doctrine of race, as dis-

tinguished from the doctrine of nationality, was brought forward in discussions on the reunion of Germany or of Italy, it really was brought forward in a shape which might fairly be called the dream of heated enthusiasts. In the case of Germany the rational and practicable union was simply the union of the German nation, not the union of the whole Teutonic race. We feel instinctively that the union of the whole Teutonic race under a single government, or even under several governments united by ties of common feelings and policy, would be simply a dream. To go no further, questions would at once arise, What is the Teutonic race? and what right has it to the name? This leads us at once to the widely different position held by the Slavonic race, as a race, from the position held by any of the other great races of Europe. The difference lies on the surface. When we speak of the Celtic or the Teutonic race, we are dealing with a fact of science, a discovery of learned inquiry, which is marked by an arbitrary scientific name. When we speak of the Slavonic race, we speak of a fact which is plain to the eyes of all men, and which is marked by a name which has been in unbroken popular use for fourteen hundred years. In the case of the Celtic and Teutonic races, their names are arbitrary; the affinities of their members may be called in question. If we speak of Celt or Teuton, we use a term of art, a name which has no popular life—a name which no one uses except under the conscious influence of learned inquiry—a name which is open to dispute, both as to its propriety and as to its extent. There is no reason for giving the Celtic name to those nations which modern inquiry classes together as Celtic, except that they must for scientific purposes have some name, and that the Celtic name will do as well as any other. But it is not, and never was, the name of the race, immemorially acknowledged by all the members of that race. With regard to the Teutonic name, it is not even clear whether the name is not altogether out of place—whether it is not, in truth, a Celtic name applied only by

mistake to any part of the race which now bears it.* At all events, it is not, and never was, a name in real general use among all those to whom it is applied. It is, in its wider use, simply a name devised by scholars, and scholars themselves are not always agreed as to the fitting extent of its range.† With the Slavonic name it is otherwise. That name has been in use everywhere from the first days when the race itself comes into notice. It has been equally familiar on the lips of the people who bore it and on the lips of their neighbours and enemies. German writers give us the history of the Slaves‡ on the Baltic and the Oder. Greek writers give us the history of the Slaves on the Danube and the Strymôn. The common kindred of the nations who bear the name is no discovery of learned research; it is, and has always been, a living fact, admitting of no dispute. The name by which that kindred is marked is no arbitrary invention of scholars: it is as truly the acknowledged name of the race as the lesser national names which it takes in are the acknowledged names of particular nations.

Of course, in saying this we speak from the point of view of general history. We do not commit ourselves to any theory as to the origin and use of the name in præ-historic, or even in early historic times. Along with the Slavonic name, in its endless forms, we find other names that may

* See First Series, p. 398.

† In English we commonly apply the name *German* to the particular German nation, perhaps without giving enough heed to the distinction of High and Low Dutch. *Teutonic* we commonly use in a wider sense. German writers, on the other hand, call their own nation *Deutsche*, while in the wider sense they commonly use *Germanen*.

‡ [I spell this name as I have been used to spell it all my life, as all those who spelled it at all spelled it twenty years back or less. The new spelling *Slav*, and the still uglier *Sclav*, have three things to be said against them. First, No English word ends in *v*. Secondly, We form the names of other nations in another way: we say, a *Swede*, a *Dane*, and a *Pole*, not a *Swed*, a *Dan*, or a *Pol*. Thirdly, It is important to bear in mind the history of the word—the fact that *slave* in the sense of *δοῦλος* is simply the same word with the national name.]

well be as ancient, perhaps as widely spread.* We do not presume to rule that the Slavonic name is the oldest of all, nor to rule how early and by what steps it came to be the common name of the race. It is enough for us that it is such a common name in a sense which is not shared by either of the names which stand beside it in ethnological inquiries. Nor is it for any one who knows but a few words of the Slavonic speech to decide dogmatically as to the origin of the Slavonic name. It may be the "glorious" folk, or it may be the "speaking" folk—the speaking folk as opposed to our "dumb" selves; for such we seem in Slavonic ears.† In either case the two ideas run nearly into one another. And one thing is certain in any case, that no national name ever had so deep a fall. In most European tongues the name of *Slave* has become equivalent to bondman; it has displaced the earlier names by which the bondmen were called. From Constantinople to Cordova, the *Slave* had, through endless wars and leadings away captive, become a *slave*. And the word in this latter sense is familiarly used by many to whom its national meaning is perhaps wholly unknown. Other national names have undergone the like kind of fate; but none has undergone it so fully, or in so many tongues.‡ The

* The earliest names of the Slaves are discussed at length by Schafarik, *Slawische Alterthümer*, i. 69, ii. 3 et seq. The name *Serb* seems to be as old as the name *Slave*, and only less widely spread. If Schafarik be right in taking the word *Σπόροι* in Procopius (*Bell. Goth.* iii. 14) to be the same word as *Serb*, he distinctly makes it the common name of the whole race. Καὶ μήν καὶ ὄνομα Σκλαβηνῶς τε καὶ Ἀνταις ἐν τῷ ἀνεκάθεν ἦν, Σπόρους γὰρ τὸ παλαιὸν ἀμφοτέρους ἐκίλουν, ὅτι δὴ σποράδην (!) οἴμαι διεσκημένοι τὴν χώραν οἰκοῦσι. The name of the *Antae* gradually goes out of use, while the Slavonic name grows and flourishes. Schafarik (ii. 25 et seq.) has collected endless forms of the name. As no Greek word begins with *σλ*, the Greeks put in, sometimes a *θ*, but more commonly a *κ*. Yet, except a few words beginning with *σκ*, as *σκληρός*, those combinations of letters are hardly more Greek than the *σλ*.

† The German nations, alas, are called by the Slaves *Nemci*, or the "dumb." The name *Slave*, in this relation, has a certain analogy to *Thiotisc*, *Dutch*, and the like, the tongue of the people, the *peod*.

‡ Schafarik (ii. 27, 47) collects several forms of the name *slave* in this sense in several languages; but he leaves out the Greek *σκλάβος*, *σκλαβία*,

parallel which most concerns ourselves is the fact that, in our own island, the name by which we chose to call the Briton, the *Wealh* or stranger, became, especially in its feminine form, one of the usual names for the state of bondage.*

Our present subject however has least to do with that part of the Slavonic race whose history caused the Slavonic name to undergo this frightful fall. It was mainly the wars of the German kings, dukes, and knights with the Slaves of the Elbe, the Oder, and the Vistula, which caused the Slave to give his name to the state of slavery. We propose now to speak mainly of the southern branches of this great race, those who have had, like other nations, their ups and downs of victory and defeat, and who, if the greater part of them have fallen under a worse bondage than their northern kinsfolk, have at least shown themselves able and worthy to win back their freedom. We wish to take up the thread of a former essay, in which we traced the history of one important part of the lands which are now Slavonic down to the moment when they became so. In speaking of the Illyrian Emperors and their Land, we traced the fate of the Dalmatian cities down to the great Slavonic immigration of the seventh century. We propose now to take up again our story from that point, with only such a view of the earlier history of the Southern Slaves, or of any other branch of the Slavonic race, as may be needed to make an intelligible story of the Slavonic settlements in the lands between the Danube and the Cretan sea.

If we cast our eye over an ethnographical map of Europe, we see at once that the Slaves occupy, in point of mere space, a region far greater than is occupied by the nations

σκλαβόνω, &c., words which should be remembered through the poem quoted by Byron—

Εἰπέ μας, δο φιλέλληνα, πῶς φέρεις τὴν σκλαβίαν.

* *Wealh* means slave or servant in several compound words, and the feminine *wylne* has altogether got the sense of a female slave. That is to say, in the process of English conquest, while the men were slain or driven out, the women were often saved alive.

either of the Teutonic or of the Romance speech. These two latter groups of nations have the advantage in many ways. The Slaves have lagged behind, while the other two groups of nations have occupied the most valuable parts of the continent and its great islands, and have played the foremost part in their history. But in mere extent of geographical surface neither of them can for a moment compare with the Slaves. The extent of unbroken Slavonic territory, from eastern Russia to Bohemia, makes the geographical aspect of the other races seem something altogether insignificant. If those vast regions were as thickly covered by man and his works as England, Belgium, or Lombardy, there would seem to be hardly room for any other people to stand by their side. But besides this great continuous Slavonic mass, the map also shows another Slavonic region, a region large in itself, but which looks small beside the other, a region which is cut off from the greater Slavonic mass by other nations which seem, as it were, thrust in between them. This second Slavonic region is the home of that group of Slavonic nations which form so large a part of the subjects of the Austrian and the Turk.* The Austrian indeed, in his character of Bohemian king, has a share in the northern mass also. But though, by dint of isolated, or nearly isolated, patches, the northern and the southern, the greater and the lesser, Slavonic regions come in many places very near to one another, yet they hardly actually touch. The two are parted asunder on the modern map by two nations, both of whom seem strangely out of place. Setting aside smaller settlements of other races, the Teutonic among them, the great mass of the territory which lies between the Northern and the Southern Slaves has its western part occupied by the Turanian Magyars, its eastern part by those Roumans who proclaim their Romance character in their very name. This non-Slavonic region placed between the two Slavonic regions consists of the Magyar, Saxon, and Rouman districts of the Hungarian kingdom, of the

* [1877.]



Rouman principality itself, and of the Rouman land east of the Pruth which has passed under the dominion of Russia.

It is a strange anomaly to find such a discordant pair of nations as Magyars and Roumans, people of agglutinative and people of Latin speech, filling up the space between the two great Slavonic masses. Of the Roumans and their migration to the lands north of the Danube we have already spoken.* The presence of a Romance-speaking people in these lands is one of the eccentricities of history, the strange and unexpected result of special causes. But the presence of the Turanian Magyars is a far more important fact. Their presence is the latest result of the old destiny which made the lands on the Lower Danube and its great tributaries the highway of all wandering nations. Teutons, Slaves, Turanians, have marched along that highway, and have either found homes elsewhere to the west or south, or else have altogether vanished, whether by destruction or by assimilation to their neighbours. At last one Turanian people, the Turks of Byzantine, the Hungarians of Western history, the Magyars as they call themselves, the Ogres of popular legend,† turned the highway into a settled dwelling-place. They sat down alongside of the Teuton and the Slave, and founded a kingdom which has become European in all except the abiding life of its old Turanian tongue. It is these Turanian incursions, from the Huns of Attila onwards, which have done more than anything else

* See above, pp. 217, 234. It is worth noticing, though it does not necessarily prove anything, that Nikētas (p. 482, ed. Bonn) identifies the Roumans with the older inhabitants of the peninsula. They are οἱ κατὰ τὸν Αἴμον τὸ ὄρος βάρβαροι, οἱ Μυσοὶ πρότερον ὀνομάζοντο, νῦν δὲ Βλάχοι κικλήσκονται.

† [Diez derives *Ogre* from *Orcus*: but it is hard to get over such evidence as will be found in Roesler, *Romänische Studien*, pp. 150, 156, 159, 260. Something which we should naturally write *Ogre* seems to be the true name, which a nasal change has turned into *Oγγηποτ*, *Ungri*, *Ungarn*, and the like. *Moger*, *Magyar*, seems to be one variety of a more general name. The use of the name as a word of fear is exactly like an use of the name *Turk* which I can remember in my childhood.]

to part asunder the two great Slavonic masses, and their history has always had a deep influence on the history of the southern division of the Slaves.

But while the Slaves lie in two great geographical masses, we must, for historical purposes, make a threefold rather than a twofold division of the race. One great group of Slavonic nations has had its main historic being in relation to the Eastern Empire and the power which has supplanted it. These are the Southern Slaves, who form our special subject, the Slaves of the Danube, the Balkan, and the Dalmatian Alps. They have their own history. The north-western group, the Slaves of the Elbe, the Oder, the Vistula, and the Baltic coast, the Slaves of Poland, Bohemia, and that great Slavonic region which has gradually put on a German garb, have another history. Their history stands mainly in relation to the Western Empire, but not till the Western Empire had itself become German. These two masses have their history apart. The close original kindred of the nations which form the two masses is shown by the appearance of the same national names in both. There is a northern and a southern Servia, a northern and a southern Chroatia. But after the kindred tribes were once parted, after the Avar and his successor the Magyar had thrust himself in between them, the history of the one group had little to do with that of the other. But to the east of that group whose dealings lay so largely with the Western Empire lies a vast Slavonic mass, which is geographically contiguous to the north-western Slaves, but whose history, in different aspects, is closely connected both with them and with the Southern Slaves. These are that great group of Slavonic nations which, gathered together under Scandinavian princes, received from those princes the name of Russians.* Russia, geographically

* On the origin and use of the Russian name see Schafarik (*Slawische Alterthümer*, ii. 65 et seq.). He makes the name, the indeclinable 'Pōs, strictly to mean the ruling Warangian settlers from Scandinavia. In this way, the use of the Russian name would be exactly analogous to the use

near to the north-western Slaves, has found its neighbourhood lead only to a long series of wars and rivalries, of alternate conquest and alternate oppression. That is, community of race has proved less strong than the causes, religious and political, which drew Catholic Poland into the system of the West and Orthodox Russia into the system of the East. Meanwhile in language, in religion, in all that makes up the life of a people, the tie of Slavonic brotherhood, which found everything to weaken it between the Pole and Russian, found everything to strengthen it between the Russian and the Southern Slave. The centre of their political and religious reverence was not the power which sat on the seven hills by the Tiber, but the power which sat on the seven hills by the Bosphorus.

It has been pointed out more than once that the position of these nations with regard to the Eastern Empire does in a general way answer to the position of the Teutonic nations with regard to the Western Empire. The analogy is marked on the face of it; but the points of unlikeness are quite as marked as the points of likeness. The analogy, in short, is a real one; the likeness is as close as, under the circumstances, it could be; but there was enough of difference in the circumstances to bring many points of unlikeness into the two relations. The Teutons in the West, the Slaves in the East, were severally those among the younger nations of Europe with which the two Empires, Western and Eastern, had most to do. The Teutons in the West,

of the Bulgarian name. In both cases the name of the ruling people would be transferred to their subjects. Constantine Porphyrogenetos often opposes Ρωσιστὶ to Σκλαβινιστὶ. But the most curious illustration of the original meaning of the name comes in the annals of Prudentius of Troyes, a. 839. (Pertz, i. 454.) Certain ambassadors come from the Eastern Emperor Theophilus to Lewis the Pious, and with them certain persons “qui se, id est gentem suam, Rhos vocari dicebant . . . ‘quorum adventus causam Imperator diligentius investigans comperit eos gentis esse Sueonum.’” So Liudprand, Antapodosis i. ii. v. 15, in reckoning up the enemies of the Eastern Empire, besides “Bulgarios nimium sibi vicinos,” reckons “Rusios quos alio nos nomine Nordmannos appellamus.”

the Slaves in the East, were the nations which settled within the Empire, who became the conquerors of its provinces, and at the same time largely became disciples as well as conquerors. Neither within the Eastern Empire nor on its borders did the Teutonic nations make any lasting settlement. The Goths played a great part in the history of the Eastern peninsula in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries; but it was not till they had passed westward into Italy, Gaul, and Spain that they founded lasting kingdoms. On the northern frontier, beyond the Danube, two Teutonic kingdoms did arise, those of the Gepidæ and the Lombards. Had they lasted, the whole history of Eastern Europe might have been changed. The part which was played by the Slave in the Eastern peninsula might have been played by the Teuton; the part which the Teuton actually did play in the West could hardly have been played by him in the East.

Some of the differences between the two cases are manifest at a glance. In the West, the Empire was, at least by a legal fiction, transferred to a Teutonic king, who kept on the titles and traditions of the elder Empire, and who made the Old Rome, if not his capital, at all events his crowning-place. In the West too new nations arose through Teutonic settlements in Roman lands, nations which kept their Roman speech with Teutonic infusions and modifications. No new nations have in the same way been formed in the East through the invasions of the Slaves. The Slavonic settlers within the Eastern Empire might profess an allegiance to the Empire which was sometimes practical, sometimes merely nominal; sometimes no such allegiance might be professed at all. Independent Slavonic princes might imitate imperial titles and imperial manners. The new settlers, whether subject or independent, might adopt the religion of the Empire, and might cultivate its language and literature alongside of their own. In some districts they might even lose their national speech and being, and be lost among some one or other of the earlier races of the

Empire. Furthermore, men of Slavonic birth might enter the service of the Empire and might rise to its highest places, the Imperial crown itself not excepted. All these things they did; but they did not create anything in the East which exactly answers to the Romance nations in the West. The one Romance nation in the East is far from being untouched by Slavonic influences. Still the Rouman speech and the Rouman nationality can hardly be said to have been modified by Slavonic influences either in the same way or to the same degree in which the Romance tongues and Romance nationalities of the West were modified by Teutonic influences. But the true Eastern parallel to the Romance tongues and nations of the West would be a tongue and a nation in which Greek and Slavonic elements answered to the Latin and the Teutonic elements in the tongues of Gaul and Spain. And this, at all events, is nowhere to be found. The mass of the Slavonic settlers remained distinct from the earlier inhabitants in the form of separate nations. Where they do not remain as separate nations, they have been altogether assimilated. Servia and the other strictly Slavonic lands answer to the lands where the Teutonic conquerors really displaced the Roman inhabitants and the Roman language; that is, to Germany west of the Rhine and south of the Danube. But there is no country in the East where the position of the Slave has been exactly what the position of the Teuton has been in Gaul and Spain. So again, though the East was ruled by whole dynasties of Slavonic Emperors, yet there is nothing in Byzantine history which at all answers to the Teutonic Emperors, Frankish and Saxon, in the West. Men of Slavonic birth became subjects of the Empire, and, when they had become subjects of the Empire, they might, like any other of its subjects, become its rulers. The Empire had Slavonic Emperors, just as at an earlier time it had Illyrian Emperors, just as it had Isaurian and Armenian Emperors. There was nothing in this to make the Empire Slavonic, Isaurian, or Armenian. It was altogether another process when the Old Rome deliberately

chose a Teutonic king to be her Emperor. The last thing which the New Rome would have thought of at any stage of her history would have been to bestow her crown on Bulgarian Simeon or on Servian Stephen.

Here then are the chief points of difference between the position of the Teutons in the West and the position of the Slaves in the East. Both were conquerors; both were disciples; but they were conquerors and disciples of very different kinds. While in the West new nations were formed and the Empire itself passed into Teutonic hands, in the East the old and the new nations remained distinct, and the Empire itself went on in quite another sense from the way in which it went on in the West. The Western succession is made out only by assuming the Eastern succession; the Eastern succession goes on without break or change. These are the two main differences, and their causes are not far to seek. We might almost sum them up in an epigram, and say that the difference between Eastern and Western Europe, between the history of the Slave and the history of the Teuton, came out of the fact that New Rome was New Rome, and not Old.

We have seen that, within the Eastern Empire, the influence of Rome and its speech remained a purely political influence, that it never could displace—that it never tried to displace—Greek culture and intellectual life, that it never tried to displace the Greek tongue as the tongue of literature and religion. Hence, while in the West the Teutonic nations were brought face to face with an unmixed Roman influence pervading and animating everything, in the East the Slavonic nations came face to face with a divided influence, an influence partly Latin, partly Greek. In the West the Empire and the Church both spoke one tongue. The bishop gave his blessing, the general gave the word of command, in the one Latin speech of Western Europe. In the East the Empire spoke one tongue and the Church another: the general gave the word of command in the tongue of Camillus and Cæsar, the bishop gave his blessing in the

tongue of Athanasios and John Chrysostom. A divided influence like this, a power which had, as it were, two minds and spoke with two tongues, could never work with the same effect on its half-conquerors, half-pupils, as the undivided Roman influence worked on the minds of the half-conquerors, half-pupils, of the Empire of the West. The elder nations of the East had bowed to the undivided influence of Greece; so the nations of the West bowed to the undivided influence of Rome. Gaul and Spain were romanized; Asia Minor was hellenized. But the power which was neither wholly Roman nor wholly Greek had not the same magic charm. The invading Slave became in many ways an apt disciple of the New Rome; but he never laid aside his own speech and national being; he could not thoroughly merge himself in a system which spoke with an uncertain voice. He became a disciple; but in becoming a disciple he became also, in a way in which the Teuton of the West never did, a rival and an enemy.

But there was another cause which also hindered the Slavonic settlers in the East from standing in exactly the same relation to the Empire in which the Teutonic settlers stood in the West. We see that, as we have already drawn it out.* This is the difference in the local position of the two Imperial cities. The Old Rome ruled by a moral influence which came in the end to have but little to do with the local city; the influence of the New Rome depended mainly on the position, political and military, of the local city itself. This enduring life of Constantinople as a local seat of dominion, the peculiar character of its civilization, as having no national basis, as being on one side Roman and on another side Greek, have mainly caused the difference between the position of the Teutons in the West and that of the Slaves in the East. Still, notwithstanding these important points of difference, the general analogy between the two settlements is plain on the face of it. The Teutons in the West, the Slaves in the East, answer to one another, as being

* See above, p. 249.

severally the representatives of the second set of Aryan settlements, those which came after the establishment of the Roman power. Out of their relations to the two parts of the Empire have grown the modern nations in their several parts of the world, as distinguished from the older nations which were there before the establishment of the Roman power, the Greeks, Albanians, and Roumans—as distinguished too from those nations wholly alien to the Aryan stock, whose abiding presence the West has not had to undergo, but who have played so great a part in the history of the East.

This last, as we remarked in an earlier essay, is the feature of Eastern Europe which more than all distinguishes its history from that of Western Europe. The appearance of Turanian nations, not as mere invaders and ravagers, but as lasting settlers, has done more than part the Northern and Southern Slaves asunder : it has been the great feature in the special history of the Southern Slaves. We are not as yet thinking of the settlement of the Ottoman Turk ; that has its parallel in Western Europe in the long occupation of Spain, the shorter occupation of Sicily, by the Saracens. A Mahometan occupation has a special character as a Mahometan occupation. In such a case ethnical distinctions are of small moment compared with religious distinctions. There was no doubt a considerable difference between occupation by the Semitic Saracen and occupation by the Turanian Turk. Still the difference between the two was as nothing compared with the difference between Mahometan occupation and occupation of any other kind. To the Slave of South-eastern Europe, as to the other nations of South-eastern Europe, the last Turanian invader, the Mahometan Turanian, the Turanian who came in by the road south of the Euxine, that is the Ottoman Turk, has ever been simply an alien enemy and an alien master. The enemy with whom there could be no community of thought or feeling, of creed or manners—was an enemy to be submitted to as long as his power was overwhelming, but whose

yoke was to be cast off as soon as there was strength in his victims to cast it off. The relations of the Southern Slaves with the earlier Turanian invaders, the heathen Turanians, the Turanians who came in by the road north of the Euxine, have been of quite another kind. Those relations do not stand out so prominently among the broad facts of history, but in a certain sense they are of far greater historical importance. The relations between the Southern Slaves and these earlier Turanian settlers have affected the national being of both to its innermost core. Drive out the Ottoman, plant and build where he has laid waste, and there will be nothing to show that the Ottoman has ever been there. But the lands north and south of the Lower Danube can never be as though Huns, Avars, Bulgarians, Magyars, a crowd of less famous nations which are negatively at least of the same family, had never pressed into them. The presence of these nations adds another point of difference—the most striking point of difference of all—between the history of Eastern and of Western Europe. It makes a difference between the position of the Slave in the East and the Teuton in the West, even greater than the differences which spring from their different relations to the Roman power and to the nations which were older than the Roman power.

We now see the vast importance of that intermediate land which lies between the Northern and the Southern Slaves, that which, as we have said, answers roughly to the kingdom of Hungary and its dependencies and to the Rouman principality. It has been by this road that the Turanian nations, pressing in one after another from the lands north of the Euxine; have made their way in the heart of Europe, and have in two cases settled down and changed themselves into European nations. It is not of much moment for our purpose carefully to distinguish their ethnical relations among themselves. How much is Turkish, how much is Finnish, how much is Mongolian, are points which deeply

concern the scientific inquirer into the races and tongues of the non-Aryan nations. For the mere European historian it is almost enough that they are non-Aryan and non-Semitic; for his purposes Huns, Turks, Bulgarians, Magyars, to say nothing of Patzinaks, Chazars, Cumans, all belong to one group, a group which is very clearly, if not negatively, defined. For his purposes it is convenient to call them Turanian, though any other name, if only it be defined at starting, will do just as well. The Magyars appear in the Byzantine writers as Turks; modern scientific inquiry calls them Fins.* So again, the Bulgarians used most commonly to be set down as Turks; one eminent scholar labours hard to make them Huns; now the belief in their Finnish origin seems established. So again, in the ancient writers, Eastern and Western, Huns and Avars, Huns and Bulgarians, are names which often get confounded. The general historian need hardly concern himself with drawing these distinctions, or in attempting to decide which theory is the most correct. For the broad purposes of European history all these nations may be classed together. They all lie outside the European and Aryan world, the world of Rome and of the Celtic, Teutonic, and Slavonic disciples of Rome. They lie equally outside the Semitic world, the world of the Phœnician, the Hebrew, and the Arab. They have had much to do with both of these worlds, but they belong to neither. On Western Europe these nations made but little impression. The first inroad of the Huns led to the great movement of the Goths in the fourth century. That movement seemed for a moment as if it were going to make the Eastern peninsula a Teutonic land; but it ended in the Goth marching off to establish himself in Italy, Gaul, and Spain. All these non-Aryan invaders play their part in Western history, the part of momentary ravagers and

* See especially the thirty-eighth and fortieth chapters of Constantine Porphyrogennētos, *De Administrando Imperio*. His Turks are always Magyars, but he says that their earlier name was Σαζαροιάσφαλοι. Zeuss (710) insists emphatically on the Hunnish origin of the Bulgarians.

destroyers, but only of momentary ravagers and destroyers. The Hun was beaten back by the sword of Aëtius and the West-Gothic Theodoric. The Avar bowed to the power of Charles the Great. The Magyar, after ravaging well-nigh all Europe, was cut down by the sword of Henry and Otto, and was bridled by the erection of that Austrian mark whose dukes were one day to grow into his own kings. Even the Bulgarian has his share in Western as well as in Eastern history; if we find him, as we should not have looked to find him, spoken of in one age as a bulwark of Greece, we find him in an age a little later, as what we should have looked for quite as little, a peaceful settler in Southern Italy.* On the South-eastern nations, above all on the South-eastern Slaves, the effect of the coming of these nations has been far deeper. Their greatest settlement has, as we have seen, placed a lasting barrier between the two great divisions of the Slavonic race which stand so far apart on the map. The Magyar power, thrust in like a wedge, divides the Old Servia from the New, the Old Croatia from the New. But, more important even than this, one great division of the Slavonic race, the greatest division of the Slaves of South-eastern Europe, passing under the rule of Turanian princes and taking a Turanian name, became in

* The earliest mention of the Bulgarians seems to be in the reign of Theodoric. Ennodius in his Panegyric speaks of the Bulgarians as overthrown by Theodoric (5, 12); and in a second, a rather obscure passage, his words are, “*Græcia est professa discordiam, secum Bulgares suos in tutela deducendo.*” But we find them not long after (see the Chronicle of Count Marcellinus 499, 502) engaged in the more natural work of harrying Thrace. The victory of the Goths over the Bulgarians is again mentioned in Cassiodorus, *Var.* viii. 21. Paul Warnefrid (i. 16, 17) describes Bulgarian wars with the Lombards; but, in v. 29, we read how “*Vulgarum dux Alzico nomine, incertum quam ob causam, a sua gente digressus, Italiam pacifice introiens, cum omni sui ducatus exercitu,*” comes to King Grinnuald, who quarters him and his followers in the parts of Beneventum. There they lived in Paul’s own day “*usque hodie in his ut diximus locis habitantes, quamquam et Latine loquantur, lingua tamen propriæ usum minime amiserunt.*” Of this original Bulgarian speech we shall be glad to have some specimens.

one age the most terrible of enemies to the Byzantine rulers of New Rome, and in another the most helpless of the victims of her Ottoman rulers. The Bulgarian stands out as the great example of the assimilation of a Turanian minority by a Slavonic majority. As such, his history is the most instructive of all histories for the present moment. When the Turanian came as a mere heathen savage, he could be Christianized, Europeanized, assimilated by an European and Christian nation. He could become a pupil. There was nothing but difference in race and speech to be got over. When he came in a positively higher position there was more than difference of race and speech to be got over. Burthened with the half-truth of Islam, with the half-civilization of the East, he could not be assimilated, Christianized, Europeanized. Neither could the nobler representative of the same system at an earlier day. The Saracen was once an unnatural excrescence on the south-western corner of Europe. The Ottoman still is an unnatural excrescence on the south-eastern corner of Europe. He cannot become a real pupil of Christian civilization ; he cannot take real root on European soil ; he can only remain for ever the alien and barbarian intruder which he was at his first coming.

We may divide the Slaves of the South-eastern peninsula into two great classes—those which did, and those which did not, come into relations of ethnical connexion with the successive Turanian settlers. It is easier to divide the two classes than to give them appropriate names. The former class may, with strict accuracy, if the historical origin of the name be remembered, be called Bulgarian. The other class we are tempted to call Servian, from the name of its most prominent member. But the Servian name cannot with any accuracy be extended to the Croatians, distinct as they were in the days of Heraclius, distinct as they remain now. We are tempted to distinguish this group as Illyrian Slaves ; but, if this name is

used, it must be remembered that it is used in a purely geographical sense, and not as implying that the Slaves of that region stand in at all the same relation to the old Illyrians in which the Slaves of the other region undoubtedly stand to the old Bulgarians. In any case, it should be remembered that the Servian name is the genuine native name of a Slavonic people, while the Bulgarian name is merely the name of Turanian conquerors assimilated and adopted by their Slavonic subjects and neighbours. For that very reason the names, if used in this way, will have a significance; they will distinguish the Servian, the pure Slave—sometimes indeed politically the subject of the Turanian Magyar, but in an ethnical point of view neither influencing him nor influenced by him—from the Bulgarian, the assimilated Slave, the Slave brought into close ethnical connexion with the Turanian, influencing him and influenced by him.

Leaving the special historians of the Slaves to trace out their earlier history, authentic or legendary, their first appearance as important actors in European history begins in the sixth century. We have a picture of them as they were then, in their seats beyond the Danube, painted by a writer who, in an age of ecclesiastical controversies and barbarian invasions, seems to belong to the band of historians of old Hellas. Procopius sets before us the Slaves of his day, like many other nations at the same stage of their growth, as living a just and peaceable life among themselves, but as capable of every excess of cruelty toward enemies in time of war. They lived in a rude and simple fashion, in houses far apart from one another. Among them the primitive democracy flourished; they had no single chief, but everything was settled in the assembly of the nation or tribe.* This of course marks a political

* The Slaves came over and over again in the Gothic war of Procopius. Their special picture is given at iii. 14. Τὰ γὰρ ἔθνη ταῦτα, Σκλαβηνοί τε καὶ Ἀνται, οὐκ ἀρχονται πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς, ἀλλ' ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ ἐκ παλαιοῦ

stage common to Slave and Teuton, and to every branch of the Aryan family. It does not shut out the authority—if we may transfer our own Teutonic names—of the *ealdorman* in peace and the *heretoga* in war. But it does shut out any one armed with the powers of a Byzantine or a Persian despot. It may well mark the stage of government by ealdormen of tribes, as distinguished from kings of nations. But these people, among whom in their own homes crimes of fraud and violence were almost unknown, laid waste every accessible province of the Empire without mercy. They wasted, they destroyed, they carried off captives, they slew, they tortured; even the refined cruelty of the stake was not unknown among them.* All this went on, almost unchecked, while the armies of the Empire were winning back Africa and Italy. Justinian saw his provinces wasted by men who he had perhaps forgotten were his own countrymen. Meanwhile he sent mercenaries of the same race, as of all other races, under a commander of their own race, to drive the Teutonic conqueror from Carthage and from Old Rome. For, if Justinian was a Slave, so was Belisarius; the codifier of the Roman law, the reviver of the Roman military power, both came of the blood of the barbarians by whom the provinces and cities of the Roman Empire were turned into howling wildernesses and desolate heaps. But inroads of this kind

βιοτεύουσι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀεὶ τά τε ξύφορα καὶ τὰ δύσκολα ἐσ κοινὸν ἔγεται. Further on he says: *Πονηροὶ μέντοι ἡ κακούργοι ὡς ἥκιστα τυγγάνουσιν ὄντες, ἀλλὰ καν τῷ ἀφελεῖ διασώζουσι τὸ Οὐννικὸν ἥθος.*

* See the account of their cruelties in Procopius, *Bell. Goth.* iii. 37, 38. The impaling is minutely described. "Ἐκτείνον δὲ τοὺς παραπίποντας οὗτε ἔξιφει οὕτε δόρατι οὕτε τῷ ἀλλῷ εἰωθότι τρόπῳ, ἀλλὰ σκολοπας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πηξάμενοι ἵνχυρότατα, ὅξεις τε αὐτοὺς ἐσ τὰ μάλιστα ποιησάμενοι, ἐπὶ τούτων ἔνιν βίᾳ πολλῇ τοὺς δειλαίους ἐκάθιζον, τὴν σκολόπων ἀκμῆν γλουτῶν κατὰ τὸ μέσον ἐνείροντες, ὀθοῦντές τε ἄχρι ἐσ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἔγκατα οὕτω δὴ αὐτοὺς διαχύσασθαι ἤξιονν. In the sixth century there were no British consuls in those parts, or some of them might have reported that the sufferers were bean-bags or curious spectators.

are, with Aryan nations at least, the mere forerunners of more lasting settlements, and we can hardly doubt that, from this time onwards, large tracts, from the Danube southward, were permanently settled by the Slavonic inhabitants who hold them still. Then and now alike, the boundary, geographical or political, is hard to draw. Which tribes asserted complete independence, which acknowledged some relation of vassalage or tribute to the Empire on whose soil they had settled, were questions the answers to which would have changed from year to year, according to the fluctuations of warfare and policy. We should be safe in saying that, in all parts, the coast and the great cities always remained to the Empire, while the greater part of the inland country was often practically, if not formally, cut off from it. In the sixth century, in the reign of Justinian, we may place the real beginning of the process by which the Slaves have become, in point of population and geographical extent, the greatest of all the races of the South-eastern peninsula.

The Slavonic settlements of which we have just been speaking must for the present be left without a name; the name which became theirs in later history had not yet been borrowed by them. The Bulgarian has not yet begun to play his historic part. The forefront of Turanian invasion is now held by the Avar, nor is it always easy in the sixth and seventh centuries to distinguish the acts of the Avars from the acts of the Slaves.* One is tempted to

* In one of the passages already quoted from Procopius there seems to be a tendency to imply that there was something Hunnish about the Slaves. By Western writers the two are not uncommonly confounded. See Schafarik, *Slawische Alterthümer*, i. 327, 512; ii. 6, 364. Constantine Porphyrogennētos twice, in his twenty-ninth chapter, identifies Slaves and Avars. Σκλάβοι οἱ καὶ Ἄβαροι καλούμενοι. Slaves and Huns, or Avars, appear acting together in Theophanēs, i. 360, 414, and Nikēphoros, of Constantinople, 20, 40 (ed. Bonn). The two sets of names seem to run naturally together in the iambics of George of Pisidia, *Bellum Avaricum*, 197,—

Σθλάβος γάρ Ούννης καὶ Σκέθης τῷ Βουλγάρῳ
αὐθίς τε Μῆδος συμφρονήσας τῷ Σκέθῃ

and some way further on (409) he distinctly speaks of—

Σθλάβων τε πλήθη Βουλγάροις μεμιγμένα.

think that Avars and Slaves must, at the beginning of the seventh century, have stood towards one another, less extensively and less permanently, in the same relation in which Bulgarians and Slaves had begun to stand to one another at the end of the seventh century. The invaders against whom Belisarius was called forth on his last efforts seem to have been strictly Huns, rather than either Avars or Bulgarians.* But in the wars of the first half of the seventh century the Avars filled the foremost place. And in the later years of the century before that, the Avars are mentioned in one special conquest, which it is clear was in its essential character Slavonic. This is no other than that Slavonic occupation of Greece itself which has been the subject of so much controversy, and a right understanding of which is so needful for any thorough grasp of the general relations of the south-eastern nations of Europe to one another.†

According to the well-known theory of Fallmerayer,‡ the whole Greek race was utterly rooted out between the sixth and the ninth centuries; the later inhabitants of Greece are simply Slaves and Albanians who learned the Greek tongue. Such a theory does in truth go far to answer itself. If the Greek race was wholly destroyed in old Greece, how came the Slaves and Albanians to adopt the Greek language in that particular part of the Empire, while they kept their own languages in other parts? The Albanian language is still to be found in Greece as the fruit of much later colonization. Of the Slavonic language there has been no trace for ages. This alone is enough to show that however large was the amount of Slavonic settlement in Greece, yet the Hellenic stock—in old Greece we may use the word—was strong enough to assimilate what must have been the less strong Slavonic element. But the

* Cf. Theophanès, i. 360, with Agathias, v. 11.

† See above, p. 332.

‡ *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters.* Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1830.

whole matter has been fully examined by the minute and unwearyed scholarship of Hopf, and the baselessness of Fallmeyer's theory has been thoroughly shewn. Hopf is followed in his conclusions by Hertzberg and Mr. Tozer. The Slavonic immigration is a fact, and a certain amount of Slavonic blood must have been assimilated by the modern Greek nation, as a certain Slavonic infusion has made its way into the modern Greek language. But this is all, and this is really no more than might have been looked for from the general history of the South-eastern peninsula. There can be no doubt that in the eighth century, if not earlier, the greater part of Greece was practically torn from the Empire by Slavonic invaders; but they never occupied the whole land. The chief cities always remained Greek, and in the latter part of the eighth century and the beginning of the ninth, the land was won back again. Old Greece formed so small a part of the Eastern Roman Empire that it is only from slight and incidental notices that we are able to put together the history of this loss and this recovery. All the facts which tell at all in his favour have been put together with great skill by Fallmeyer.* But it is hard to see how his facts bear out his conclusions, and some of his facts have been set aside by Hopf. In the year 577, and again in 584, the Slaves, possibly under Avar leaders, made their way into Pelopon-nêsos. But it would seem that the effects of this invasion have been a good deal exaggerated. But it is clear that from this time Slavonic settlements in Greece went on forming, and a plague in the days of Constantine Koprô-

* See his third and fourth chapters, and Finlay, Mediæval Greece and Trebizond, p. 14 et seq.; Zeuss, *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, 624; the chapter in Schafarik's second volume, *Die Bulgarischen Slaven*; Hopf, *Griechische Geschichte*, i. 100; Hertzberg, *Geschichte Griechenlands seit dem Absterben des antiken Lebens*, i. 120. The most important passages have often been quoted. The date 584 comes from a writing of the Patriarch Nicolas in the time of Alexios Komnênos, who speaks of it as καταστροφὴ τῶν Ἀβάρων, though the colonization was certainly Slavonic. See Zeuss, 625; Jirécek, 121 et seqq.

nymos marks a special æra. From this time we are told that the parts which they occupied were altogether cut off from the Empire, and that a Roman—in modern phrase a Greek—was hardly ever seen among them. At last, in 775, Eirēnē, being at peace with the Saracens, sent Staurakios to subdue the Slaves in Hellas. He entered Peloponnēsos, and brought its Slavonic people into at least a tributary relation to the Empire. But nearly thirty years later, in 802, the Slaves had again won strength enough to attack the city of Patrai with the help of a Saracen fleet. And they were defeated, in the belief of the time, only by the personal intervention of the Apostle Andrew, who is spoken of in the West as the mildest of saints,* but who, at such a moment as this, showed himself as a mounted warrior, weapons in hand. When Constantine Porphyrogennētōs wrote, a hundred and forty years later, he knew of only two Slavonic tribes in Peloponnēsos. These two, the Milēngians and the Ezerites, kept their freedom, on a mere payment of tribute, in the mountains of Taÿgetos and on the shore by Helos. But it is quite certain that the Slaves were not utterly rooted out. We hear of them again in the days of the Frank conquest of Morea, and they may even be traced down to the days just before the Turkish conquest, when Peloponnēsos was again won back by Constantinople. In the last struggle with the Turk, the remnant of the Peloponnēsian Slaves seem to have been content to merge themselves in the Greeks, exactly as the Albanians of Greece did in the War of Independence.†

We thus have full proof of a long Slavonic occupation of a great part of Greece, an occupation which cannot fail to have caused a considerable admixture of Slavonic blood in

* Saint Andrew appears in England as “sanctorum mitissimus.” His warlike exploits at Patrai are recorded by Constantine Porphyrogennētōs (*De Ad. Imp. 49*). See above, p. 335.

† See Finlay, Mediæval Greece and Trebizond, 268, 275. The last mention of the Slaves in Greece is as late as the first years of the fifteenth century.

the veins of all the latter inhabitants of Greece. In the eyes of the outer world, perhaps Peloponnēsos in particular, certainly the coast of the South-eastern peninsula in general, was *Sclavinia*, just as Dalmatia was, just as Mecklenburg was.* But there is nothing in all this to justify the notion that the modern Greeks are nothing but Slaves who have learned Greek. Fallmerayer's own story shows that, during the whole Slavonic occupation, the chief towns and the greater part of the coast were still held by the Empire. He enlarges almost withunction on the strictly Hellenic character of Monembasia. Nor does he fail to quote the emphatic witness of the imperial geographer, that the men of Maina, who kept their wild independence then as they did down to our own times, were no Slaves, but descendants of the old Romans—stiff-necked pagans, unbaptized till the days of Basil, who still cherished the worship of the gods of Hellas, the only people who still bore the name of Hellènes. Fallmerayer himself gets specially eloquent on this last point, enlarging on the three religions which existed side by side in the peninsula. While Christ and the Panagia were still worshipped at Patrai and Corinth, altars still smoked to Zeus and Apollo among the mountain holds of the Mainotes; and to Radagast and the other idols of the Slaves in the mountain holds of the Ezerites.† The history of the Slavonic occupation and of the Greek recovery of Peloponnēsos is clearly written in the local nomenclature of the land. Alongside of the old Hellenic names which have lived on to our own day, we find a crowd of Slavonic names of smaller places. And we find too a more remarkable class of names still, names unknown in ancient times, but as truly Hellenic as the ancient names.

* Σκλαβίνια, *Sclavinia*, means any Slavonic land. In our own day it has specially settled down on the land between the Save and the Drave. Fallmerayer and Finlay (19) quote a passage from the *Acta Sanctorum*, in which Monembasia is said to be in "Slavinica terra." But a good deal of doubt is thrown on the application by Hopf.

† See Fallmerayer, 260, and above, p. 331.

These could only have been given in the process by which the men of the Peloponn̄esian cities again won back the Peloponn̄esian land. The Taÿgetos of old Lakonian geography, the stronghold of the Slavonic Ezerites, is known to Constantine by the name of Pentedaktylos, a name than which nothing can be more purely Greek, but which, as the name of a Peloponn̄esian mountain, would have been as little understood by Libanius as by Homer.*

The Slavonic occupation of Peloponn̄esos stands as a kind of episode in the general history of the relations of the Southern Slaves towards the Empire. From the time of their first settlement, their history, so far as we know it, stands by itself, and may be followed out by itself to the end. Still it is part of the great settlement of the sixth century, the general settlement of the Slaves in the lands stretching from the Lower Danube to the Ionian and Ægæan seas. But before the events which gave that settlement its special character, another chain of events had founded another set of Slavonic settlements, whose history is in some points distinct from theirs. After, so to speak, Bulgaria had come into being, but before it had become Bulgaria, the Slavonic settlements in Illyricum, in the narrower sense, the settlements in Servia, Croatia, and Dalmatia, as distin-

* Fallmerayer is rich in his lists of Slavonic names; and there is no denying that a large part of the nomenclature of modern Greece is Slavonic, any more than that a large part of the nomenclature of northern England is Danish. But some of the names, while they prove the presence of Slaves, prove something else also. Such a name as Σκλαβοχωρίον, like Φραγγοχωρίον in later times, exactly answers to our own Danby and Nor[th]-manton. These names imply the presence of Slaves and Franks; but they imply also that the general population of the country was not Slave or Frank. In p. 247 he compares the process by which the Slaves were hellenized with the process by which the Teutonic settlers in Italy were romanized. The parallel is ingenious, but fallacious, and it tells against its own argument. No large part of Italy was wholly settled by Teutonic colonists. The parallel, in short, would tend to make the Slavonic occupation of Greece less extensive than we have every reason to believe that it was.

guished from those in Mœsia, Thrace, and Macedonia, had begun. The lands in the triangle between the Save and the Hadriatic had been wasted over and over again by Slaves and Avars, when Heraclius bethought himself of planting a wholly new race of colonists on the wasted land. They were Slaves, but Slaves from more distant lands. They were Slavonic foes of the Avars, who craved help of the Roman power against the common enemy, and whom the Roman Emperor was well pleased to plant in that distant corner of his nominal dominions as a bulwark against the Turanian invader. Detachments of two Slavonic nations were led to change their seats for the purpose, and to come from the lands watered by the Elbe and the Vistula into the lands watered by the great tributaries of the Danube. Modern geography has forgotten their names in their older seats; but in the outlying colonies they still remain, after twelve hundred years' occupation, after endless revolutions, changes of dynasty, changes of masters. It may surprise some to look for the older Servia in the land which is now familiar as the kingdom of Saxony. But there lies the old Servia or Sorabia—the spellings of all their names are endless—which, like most of the earlier seats of these migratory nations, is distinguished as the Great or the White. By the time of Constantine Porphyrogennêtos it was distinguished as the Unbaptized. Apart from the old Serbs lay the old Chrobatians or Croats, the people of the Old or White or Unbaptized Chroatia, in the south-western part of what afterwards was Poland.* These tribes occupied

* The geography of Constantine's account (31) is worth noticing. Ιστέον ὅτι οἱ Σέρβοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀβαπτίστων Σέρβλων τῶν καὶ ἀσπρῶν ἐπονομαζομένων κατάγονται, τῶν τῆς Τούρκιας ἐκεῖθεν κατοικούντων εἰς τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς Βοϊκού τόπον ἐπονομαζόμενον, ἐν οἷς πλησιάζει καὶ ἡ Φραγγία, δμοίως καὶ ἡ μεγάλη Χρωβατία ἡ ἀβάπτιστος ἡ καὶ ἀσπρη προσαγορευομένη. Elsewhere (c. 30), οἱ Χρωβάτοι κατώκουν τηνικάτην ἐκεῖθεν Βαγιβαρείας, ἔνθα εἰσὶν ἀρτίως οἱ Βελοχρωβάτοι. See Schafarik, ii. 242 et seqq. The Βελοχρωβάτοι and the ἀσπρη Χρωβαρία translate one another. It is worth noticing that the imperial geographer is led away by one very false bit of etymology: Σέρβοι τῇ τῶν Ρωμαίων διαλέκτῳ δοῦλοι προσαγορεύονται . . . ταῦτη δὲ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔσχον οἱ Σέρβοι.

Illyricum by imperial authority, and for some ages they kept on a nominal and precarious allegiance to the Empire, in opposition, first to the Avar and then to the Bulgarian. And, as subjects and champions of the Christian Empire, some at least had from the beginning embraced the religion of the Empire. But both their Christianity and their allegiance seem to have sat lightly upon them. The Imperial geographer is driven to confess that, down to the accession of his grandfather, not only the Slavonic settlers, but even the Dalmatian coast towns became practically independent of the Empire, and that the greater part of the Slavonic settlers were still unbaptized.* It is plain however that the coast towns never wholly cast aside their allegiance.

When Charles the Great spread his power over a large part of these Illyrian Slaves, he respected the tie which bound the coast cities to the rival Empire.† But it was not till the reign of Basil the Macedonian that either Christianity or the Imperial power again won back any firm footing in these lands. By his zeal the greater part of the Illyrian Slaves were converted to the faith. His grandson always pointedly contrasts the baptized Croats and baptized Serbs, who were nominally at least his own vassals, with the unbaptized Croats and Serbs who lived far

διὰ τὸ δοῦλοι γενέσθαι τὸν βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων. It is not always clear what language is meant by ἡ τῶν Ῥωμαίων διάλεκτος: here it plainly is Latin. On this matter, and on the whole early history of the Serbs and Croatians, see the chapters in Schafarik's second volume, *Die Serbischén Slawen* and *Die Ch'rowatischen Slawen*.

* According to Constantine, De Adm. Imp. 29, all the people of these parts had become practically independent. Γεύόνταςιν αὐτοκέφαλοι, μήτε τῷ βασιλεῖ Ῥώμαιῶν μήτε ἐπέρῳ τινὶ ὑποκείμενοι . . . ἀλλὰ οἱ πλειόνες τῶν τοιούτων Σκλάβων οὐδὲ ἐβαπτίζοντο; ἀλλὰ μέχρι πολλοῦ ἔμενον ἀβάπτιστοι. He then goes on to describe the missionary work of his apostolic grandfather.

† Einhard (Vita Karoli, 15) describes the conquests of Charles the Great in these regions as “Utraque Pannonia, et adposita in altera Danubii ripa Dacia, Histria quoque et Libernia atque Dalmatia, exceptis maritimis civitatibus quas, ob amicitiam et junctum cum eo fœdus, Constantino-politanum imperatorem habere permisit.”

away in their old homes. But even now the re-establishment of the Imperial power in these regions was but nominal. The cities clave to the Empire; but it was found expedient to allow them to pay tribute to the Slavonic chiefs in their neighbourhood. And one stiff-necked portion of the settlers altogether refused to accept either the dominion or the faith of the Empire. Between Spalato and Ragusa lay the land of the unconverted Narentines, the *Pagania* of those days.* And, besides their possessions on the mainland, the Pagans of Constantine's day held several of the greatest of the Dalmatian islands. Pharos, then still Pharos, but now Lesina, the old Parian colony of Dionysios—busy Brazza, whose name has not changed—Meleda, the Dalmatian rival of Malta for the honour of having sheltered the Apostle, with her long line of coast rising from the sea, jagged like a comb, or like a range of barrows covering the bones of the men of forgotten days—the northern Korkyra too, black Korkyra, with her thick woods, so rare a crown among the Dalmatian coasts and islands—all these, among the loveliest regions of the lovely shore of the Adriatic archipelago, formed, in the days of the Imperial geographer, part of the land whose name proclaimed that there the rule of Christ and of Cæsar was alike unknown. For one who has seen those lands, indeed for any one who, even without seeing them, has caught in any measure the charm of their wonderful history, the minute picture which the Imperial geographer draws of the Illyrian land, and especially of the Dalmatian shore, has a surpassing interest. His whole book is read with a singular feeling, one common indeed to the whole range of Byzantine writers, but which seems especially drawn forth by the writings of Constantine. There is something taking in a picture of a large part of Europe in days that are comparatively modern, put forth by an Imperial hand, in a tongue which, setting aside the inevitable technical terms, differs but little from the tongue, if not of Attic, at least of Alex-

* See above, p. 25.

andrine, times. There is something which is in a manner unexpected, when we find Russians and Saracens and Hungarians, though the last are veiled under the name of Turks—when we read of Charles the Frank and Otto the Saxon, and Lewis and Hugh the kings, the *p̄ῆγες*, of Italy—not for the world would the Eastern Augustus give them his own style of *βασιλεύς*—spoken of in a tongue in which we are more accustomed to read the acts of Lysandros and Alki-biadēs. The whole takes us out of our ordinary range of thought ; it brings together lands, and names, and tongues, which in our ordinary range of thought are kept apart, and is a living witness to the truth that their history is one. We read of Russia in her earliest days, in her first greatness, presently to be shivered by internal divisions and by Mongolian inroads. We see her in the days when the Slavonic subjects of Scandinavian rulers came down the Dnieper in their canoes, not then to set free, but to threaten, the imperial city by the Bosphorus. We read the long tale of Chersōn, the city where Greek life and Greek freedom lived on so long by the northern shores of the Euxine ; where, unknown we may well believe to most of the combatants on either side, the war of Sebastopol was fought in our days over the ruins of the most abiding of Hellenic commonwealths. But there is no part of his work over which our Imperial guide evidently lingered with greater interest than over his picture of the whole Illyrian land, and especially of the Dalmatian coast. It is inconceivable that he can ever have visited it for himself; we may be sure that Constantine seldom trusted himself very far from the walls of the New Rome. Yet he must have taken a special interest in the land, an interest which he did not feel when he wrote his strictly geographical work on the provinces of the Empire, but which had come upon him before he sat down to write the more elaborate work in which he teaches his son how a wise Emperor ought to deal with Russians, Turks, Patzinaks, and Chazars. By the time that he wrote the *De Administrando Imperio* he had learned

something more about the land of Diocletian than when he wrote his youthful exercise on the Themes. It is significant that he has no Bulgarian chapter. The subjects of Simeon were a race beyond the reach of diplomatic tricks, a race on which a Macedonian Emperor who could not foresee the mighty deeds of his own grandson would not dwell with the same satisfaction with which he dwells on the story of Servians and Croats brought within the fold by his grandfather. We follow him along the shore ; we might almost use him as a guide-book. It is with a strange feeling that the traveller who has seen, who has perhaps almost found out for himself, the wonderful round church of Zara, with its mighty columns still grand amid neglect and desecration, turns to find a building which many modern writers seem to have passed by without notice minutely and accurately described by the Imperial penman nine hundred years back.* We read how ruined Salona gave way to Spalato, how ruined Epidauros gave way to Raousion or Ragusa, the city of the rocks. We follow our guide up the inland sea of Salona to the island city of Tetrangourion, to Träu, with the wondrous portal of its *duomo*. We sail in with him to the mouths of Cattaro, the Dekatera of his day. As usual, we puzzle over his etymology, but we acknowledge the accuracy of his description of the narrow sea, surrounded by the heaven-reaching mountains. We go with him inland to his Terbounia, now Trebinje in its Turkish bondage.† One short chapter, drier and less instructive than most, wakes up a thought which, in a work written nine hundred years back, could only be conspicuous by its absence. There is not much to learn from his thirty-fifth chapter, devoted to the land of Dioklēa. He who in other parts of his work traces the advance of Mahometan power in earlier times—he who

* De Adm. Imp. c. 29. But our guide is more lucky in his architecture than in his etymology. What can he mean when he says, Τὸ κάστρον τῶν Διαδώρων καλεῖται τῇ Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτῳ ίάμ ἔρατ, ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύται ἀπάρτι ἡτον' δηλονότι ὅτε ἡ Ῥώμη ἐκτισθή, προεκτισμένον ἦν τὸ τοιοῦτον κάστρον;

† [1877.]

traces back the name of Dioklēa to the days and the works of Jovius—he who has traced the migration which brought the Slaves into the Illyrian land, and which caused the wide line to be drawn between the converted and unconverted Serb—could not foresee that, five hundred years after his day, a wild mountain within that obscure district of Dioklēa should become the last citadel of Slavonic freedom and Christian faith. He could not foresee that in that land such a bulwark could be needed against the creed which, in his day was terrible on the Euphrates, but was known on the shores of the Adriatic only by rare visits of plunder from Africa or Sicily. He who next writes the history of the land of Dioklēa will have a longer tale to tell. Within its narrow bounds rises the Black Mountain, the stronghold where barbarian foot may never tread,* before the sight of whose valiant sons the hosts of the barbarian quail in deadly terror, and leave only to the lying scribes of the vanquished Porte the poor satisfaction of writing, in this or that note or protocol or circular, that they “regard Montenegro as an integral part of the Ottoman Empire.”†

* [Or only to be driven out again, as in 1877.]

† [The reference given in 1877 was to the Turkish answer to the Protocol of April in that year. It is now more useful to mark that in the Treaty of San Stefano, Article II., the words were: “La Sublime Porte reconnaît définitivement l’indépendance de la Principauté de Monténégro.” This was a different formula from that employed in Articles III. and V. with regard to Servia and Roumania, where the word “définitivement” was not used. The difference was clearly meant to mark the undoubted fact of past history and present politics that, while Servia and Roumania had been tributaries of the Turk up to that moment, Montenegro had never been his tributary at any time. But though the fact could not be denied, it seems to have been thought inconvenient in some quarters, as we read (Protocols of the Congress of Berlin, 147): “Lord Salisbury dit que son gouvernement n’a jamais reconnu cette indépendance et demande la suppression du mot ‘définitivement.’” A process described as an “exchange of ideas” now follows, the result of which seems to be that Russia, Austria, Germany, and France, had all acknowledged the independence of Montenegro in one way or another. But it is only the Russian Plenipotentiaries who say manfully, “que leur gouvernement n’a jamais cessé

Here then is one of the great divisions of the Slavonic settlers in the South-eastern peninsula, the division which is traced up to the settlements under Heraclius in the seventh century. These are the Slaves who form the main part of the population of old Illyricum. Of them came the Servian and Croatian kingdoms, the momentary Servian Empire of the fourteenth century, the later kingdom of Bosnia, and the duchy of Santa Saba, so well known to us for the last two years under the name of Herzegovina. Of them came the Slavonic subjects of Venice on her Dalmatian coast, the *Sea-Vlachs*, the *Morlacchi*, and the valiant men of the shore of the *Bocche di Cattaro*. The fluctuations of boundaries between these several powers was endless. So were their fluctuations towards their neighbours on all sides, to the Eastern Roman Empire, to the Bulgarian and the Magyar, and in after days to the Venetian and the Turk. Among them the Croats are the branch which makes the smallest figure in general history. Between their days of subjection, at one time to the Eastern, at another to the Western, Empire, their day of independence was short, though they did for a moment show themselves rivals of the growing power of Venice. But for ages the Croatian crown has been worn by the Hungarian kings, and the large adoption of the Latin faith has tended greatly to cut off this branch of the Slavonic

de la reconnaître, puisque les Princes de Monténégro n'étaient point confirmés par le Sultan et ne payaient point de tribut." Nevertheless, though all the facts and all the ideas seem to have been on one side, the word "définitivement" disappears from the treaty, and the clause finally appeared in this shape (Article XXVI.): "L'indépendance du Monténégro est reconnue par la Sublime Porte et par toutes celles des hautes parties contractantes qui ne l'avaient pas encore admise."

The inference would seem to be that there are minds which think that the facts of both past and present can be got rid of because they do not choose to acknowledge them—which think it to their credit that a record of their ignorance or obstinacy should go forth to the world—and which further think it dignified to offer a petty insult to a small power guilty of the crime of maintaining its independence, because they find themselves unable to take its independence away.]

race from the general Slavonic cause in the south-eastern lands. The Servian race, in all its forms and all the shifting of its territory, has a higher interest, an interest which gathers in a higher degree round the principality of Montenegro, which has ever remained as the abiding representative of Servian independence, than even round the larger Servian principality which has won back its freedom in our own times. Geographically however this last comes nearer to representing the old Servian kingdom, though it is far indeed from representing it in its full extent. When we say this, we mean the Servian kingdom proper. Shifting as its boundaries were on all sides, it still kept up some kind of geographical continuity, and the modern principality represents it as a part represents the whole. The Empire of Stephen Dushan, when the Servian Czar reigned from the Danube to the Corinthian Gulf, was but the wonder of a moment. It naturally broke in pieces on the death of its founder, and left a crowd of small states, Slave, Greek, and Frank, for the Turk to devour, all but one. Yet the kingdom of Servia which still went on, made tributary by the fight of Kossovo, then alternately independent or tributary, as Timour broke in pieces the Ottoman in Asia or as Huniades cut him short in Europe, lived in one form or another till its final incorporation by Mahomet the Conqueror. And it is with strangely mingled feelings that we read how the warriors of tributary Servia, doing service to their Ottoman overlord, turned the day for Islam and against Christianity at Nikopolis. It is as when, almost a thousand years before, the East-Goth marched under the banner of Attila to meet, but not to overcome, Aëtius and Theodoric on the Catalaunian Fields. Another form of interest and instruction is supplied by the history of the Bosnian kingdom, the newest of the chief Slavonic powers in this region, but the last, save the unconquered remnant on the Black Mountain, to maintain its independence of the Ottoman invader. No history teaches more clearly how closely interwoven in these lands the two notions of religion

and nationality have ever been, and how completely it was owing to disunion, mainly to religious disunion, that these lands came under the power of the barbarian. Bosnia, after endless shiftings, comes out in the fourteenth century as a separate kingdom, ruled by Catholic kings and closely connected, both in war and peace, with Catholic Hungary. It has a somewhat different history from Orthodox Servia, and from Bulgaria, a land essentially Orthodox, though its princes so often coquetted with the Pontiffs of the elder Rome. In all these lands the Bogomilian heresy, the remnant of the old Paulicians or Manichæans, lived on to form both a religious and a political difficulty. But it was in Bosnia that it assumed especial importance, and was the cause of special weakness when the strife with the Mussulman came. In no Christian land, save in Albania, did apostasy take place on so great a scale. But there is a marked difference between apostasy in Bosnia and apostasy in Albania. In Albania apostasy might almost be called national; whole tribes at least embraced Islam. In Bosnia the nobles embraced Islam, in order to keep their estates and the dominion over the rest of the people under a new title. Here, as in Crete, the Mussulman population is of native descent, as truly Greek in one case, as truly Slave in the other, as their Christian neighbour. The mass of the Christian population of Bosnia is now Orthodox; but it is the Mahometan and the Catholic who keep up the traditions of the Bosnian kingdom. The heart of the Orthodox Bosnian is with his Orthodox brethren in Servia.

At this point some other considerations with regard to the Illyrian lands are strongly forced upon us by comparing their early history with their present state.* We are brought

* [I thought it best to leave this paragraph, at the expense of some little repetition, exactly as it was written in 1877. Since then Bosnia and Herzegovina have passed under Austrian rule, in a shape and after a fashion which has discontented both Christians and Mussulmans, but which may lead to some better state of things in the long run. At all events the body and the mouth are again united, and in any future arrangements the

back to the argument of our former article. For a few centuries in the world's history Illyricum was an united land, and, while it was an united land, it was a flourishing land. The history of Illyricum down to the Roman conquest sets before us a barbarian land famous only for robbery and piracy, fringed by a few Greek colonies, of late foundation and quite secondary importance, on its coasts and islands. Under the *Pax Romana*, Illyricum became one of the most flourishing regions of the earth. This prosperity lasted through the days of direct Roman rule, down to the time of the Avar and Slavonic inroads. That is to say, during those few centuries the body and its mouths were united; the great mainland watered by the tributaries of the Danube had its natural outlet in the Dalmatian havens. Before and after this time the body and the mouths were parted asunder. Never since the sixth century, among all the strivings of Slave, Frank, Magyar, Venetian, Turk, Frenchman, and Austrian, amid all the tossings to and fro between one master and another, have these lands again been what they were from Augustus to Justinian, when they were a really united body, in which the mainland and the coast were not unnaturally kept asunder. The extreme

fate of the two cannot be kept apart. Thus far a point for the future has been gained, though at the cost of much immediate wrong and suffering. Whatever passes away from the Turk to any European power is so far a gain. The treatment of Montenegro is another matter. Her warriors had again won their way to their own sea from which she had been so long cut off; but, of the three havens which they had won with their own right hands, one is given back hopelessly to the barbarian—another is seized by the coward power which has not pluck to do either good or evil, but which stands by to steal the fruits from those who do either—the possession of the third is indeed left to those who have won it, but clogged by the most insulting restrictions which the brute force of great powers ever imposed on an independent state whose littleness is in truth its glory. Base as was the filching of Cattaro, the filching of Spizza by Austria, the betrayal of Dulcigno to the Turk, was baser. To the filching of Spizza the two usual arguments of “*felix Austria*” do not apply. It had neither been held by some predecessor in remote ages, nor had any nearer forefather found a wife there.]

point of unnatural division is to be found on the coast of the *Bocche* and at the foot of the Black Mountain. The Montenegrins, with their perfect independence—the men of the *Bocche*, under civilized but still alien rule—the men of Herzegovina, in their barbarian bondage—are parted from each other by nothing but the merest political accident. They feel as brethren; they act as brethren; when one of the three draws the sword, the other two draw it also. And be it remembered that only a few years past the Austrian, as well as the Turk, had to learn what the pistols and yataghans which hang in every man's girdle can do in time of need.* This is the extreme case of unnatural disunion; but unnatural disunion is the fate of the whole land, and the cuckoo-cry about the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire means, among the other evil things that it means, the continuance of this disunion. The Magyar is perhaps chiefly led by blind hatred to the Slave; but every statesman of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy instinctively feels that the Eastern question touches him as well as the Turk. So far as the Eastern question is a Slavonic question, so far it will never be settled unless the lands under Austrian rule, as well as the lands under Turkish rule, are taken into account. We do not presume to say what the final solution ought to be, whether it is to be sought in empire or in federation, in founding new states or in enlarging old ones. It may be that two years back† the self-styled Emperor, more truly the King of Illyria, Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slavonia, had the game in his own hands, if he had known how to play it. Instead of stooping to be the treacherous jailor of Ljubebratich, Francis

* Some account of the insurrection in the *Bocche di Cattaro* in 1869 will be found in the seventeenth chapter of *Le Monténégro Contemporain*, by G. Frilley and Jovan Wlahovitz (Paris, 1876). The general relations of the Montenegrins, the *Bocchesi*, and the people of Herzegovina, may be well studied in Mr. Stillman's book, *Herzegovina and the late Uprising, and the Causes of the latter, and the Remedies* (London, 1877), the work of one who records what he himself saw, and whose Cretan experience made him better able to understand what he saw.

† [That is, in 1875.]

Joseph might well have become the liberator of the Slavonic lands. He might perhaps have carried out the dreams of Charles the Sixth, and have exchanged his sham Imperial crown for a real one.* The question is again further complicated by the yearning of at least a party in Italy for the Italian-speaking cities which fringe the Slavonic coast. We do not take upon ourselves to draw out a scheme, or to draw out a map; things turn out better when events are left to shape themselves. But we do lay it down as a principle, that no settlement of these lands will be wholesome or lasting which does not make the coast and the land behind it, in some shape or another, parts of one political whole. Above all things, one deed of justice should be done. It is like a feeling of being in prison to stand on the Black Mountain, to look down on the *Bocche*—to look across the narrow ridge that fences in the *Bocche* to the wide Adriatic itself—and to feel that the unconquered land has no outlet to the sea, that it is left to the mercy of its jealous neighbours. Talk not of this or that paltry creek, of the navigation of this or that paltry stream to be ceded by or wrested from the Turk. Give back to the men of the Black Mountain the haven which they won from the common enemy of Europe when Englishmen and Montenegrins fought side by side. The city at the bottom of the ladder must again be joined to the mountain plain at the top of the ladder. The men of the mountain and the men of the *Bocche*, brothers in arms in so many struggles, must live under a common and national rule. Cattaro, which Austrian and Frenchman joined to filch from Venice—which, when the plunderers quarrelled, the Austrian could not keep from the Frenchman—which the Montenegrin won from the Frenchman with his own right hand, in the common cause of Europe—which the Austrian filched back again, and which Russia and England stood by and saw

* [See First Series of Essays, p. 282. But the Roumans have since shown themselves worthy of independence, and the Magyar kingdom has declined the honourable task then suggested for it.]

him filch—the old Dekatera of Constantine, the whole shore of that lovely gulf and the valiant men who dwell upon it, must be again joined to the dominion of the only ruler whom they will acknowledge as a national sovereign. The men of the *Bocche* may be constrained to look to Francis Joseph of Vienna as an alien lord: it is Nicolas of Cettinje to whom alone they look as the prince of their own race.

This may be enough with regard to that section of the Slaves who settled in what is now the north-eastern corner of the Ottoman dominions, and in the adjoining Austrian, Hungarian, and Montenegrin lands. Their history, as we have sketched it, has in some sort interrupted the history of the other great division of their race in the South-eastern peninsula; those namely who came more distinctly under Turanian influences. We have seen that the Slavonic settlements in Moesia, Macedonia, and Greece began before the settlements in Illyricum;* but it was not till shortly after the Slavonic settlement of Illyricum that the event took place which gave those settlements their special character. That connexion between the Slaves and the Turanian nations, which took a less lasting shape in the case of Huns and Avars, became one of the great facts of history in the case of the Bulgarians. Exactly as the name of the original Scandinavian Russians passed to their Slavonic subjects, and so became the name of one of the great divisions of the Slavonic race, so the name of the original Turanian Bulgarians passed from them to their Slavonic subjects, and became the name of another great division of the Slavonic race.† We left the Slaves of

* The way in which all this land had become Slavonic nowhere comes out more clearly than in a few words inserted in the *Chrestomathia*, or extracts from Strabo, in C. Müller's *Geographi Graeci Minores*, ii. 574. Νῦν δὲ πᾶσαν Ἰπερίον καὶ Ἐλλάδα σχεδὸν καὶ Πελοπόννυστον καὶ Μακεδονίαν Σκύθαι Σκλάβοι νέμονται. Is it too great a refinement to hint that Σκύθαι Σκλάβοι might mean Slaves under Scythian, that is Bulgarian, rule?

† Two Byzantine writers, Theophanès (i. 544, ed. Bonn) and Nikēphoros of Constantinople (38), give accounts—that in Theophanès a rather minute

Moesia and Macedonia without a name when we passed to the history of the Slaves of Illyricum. The Slaves of Illyricum had not been long in their new land before their brethren to the south and east of them got them a name through the great Turanian inroad which gave the old Bulgarian a home south of the Danube. Hitherto we have heard of Bulgarians, as of other Turanian nations, as occasional plunderers. In 679* they crossed the great border stream, and founded a lasting kingdom in the land which has ever since borne their name. Settled in a Slavonic land, ruling over a vast majority of Slavonic subjects, the princes and the whole ruling order of the old Bulgarians were gradually lost in the general Slavonic mass. They adopted the Slavonic language of their subjects, while their subjects adopted the name of their Bulgarian rulers. The case is exactly analogous to a far more famous case in Western Europe. The romanized inhabitants of Gaul gradually took the name of their Frankish conquerors, while their Frankish conquerors gradually adopted the Latin speech of their subjects. Modern Bulgaria and the modern Bulgarians have come to bear the name by which they are now called through exactly the same process by which modern France and the modern French have come to bear the name which they now bear. The case would be very much the same if England were called Normandy, and her people Normans. The Bulgarian land on the Volga—Great Bulgaria—kept its name long after the New or Black Bulgaria arose on the Danube.† It remained Turanian; it became Mahometan; it

account—of the original Bulgarians. They both connect them with the Huns. Theophanēs speaks of the seven Slavonic tribes which the Bulgarians brought under their power.

* [It is somewhat singular that, though 1879 has seen the new birth of the latest Bulgaria, no one, even in these days of centenaries and millenaries, seems to have remembered that it was the twelfth hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the first Bulgarian state south of the Danube.]

† Ἡ πάλαι καλουμένη μεγάλη Βουλγαρία, says Theophanēs. The land immediately south of the mouths of the Danube commonly goes by the

flourished as a Mahometan power, till, in the fifteenth century, it yielded to the advance of Russia, and gave the Russian Czar one of his endless titles.* The modern Bulgarians then may be distinguished from the Illyrian Slaves as Slaves who have been brought under a certain measure of Turanian influence, and who have taken the name of their Turanian masters. Either this or some other cause has undoubtedly given the Bulgarians a nationality of their own, distinct from that of the other Slaves. They speak too, so Slavonic scholars tell us, a distinct dialect of the common Slavonic speech. How far its special character is due to Turanian influences or to Turanian infusion it is for Slavonic scholars to settle; but it is plain on the face of general history that the Bulgarians had, and still have, a very distinct national life of their own. Their relation to the Empire was wholly different to that of the Illyrian Slaves. These last kept up some kind of relation to the Empire almost down to the time of the Latin conquest. They were sometimes independent, sometimes tributary, sometimes under Byzantine governors, as the Empire was weaker or stronger from time to time. But the theory at least of overlordship was never given up. The Slaves of Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece were, at least in Imperial eyes, simply revolted subjects who were to be brought back to obedience whenever it was possible. Towards them no definite frontier could be drawn, because in them no measure of independence was ever formally acknowledged. But Bulgaria, whether as a kingdom of heathen Fins or of Christian Slaves, was another matter. Its princes were the only neighbours in whom the Emperors stooped to

name of *Maurobulgaria*, or Black Bulgaria; but Fallmerayer sees in the former part of the word a Slavonic name for the sea, just as in *Morea*.

* [See Roesler, *Römänische Studien*, 249. Not long ago some zealous patriot fished up the fact that the Russian Emperor is "Prince of Bulgaria," to use it as a new charge against the supposed enemy. Never having heard of Bulgaria on the Volga, he fancied that the title referred to Bulgaria on the Danube.]

acknowledge something like equals. What passes into their hands openly passes away, at least for the time. There was a frontier, a frontier which was often fixed by treaty, a frontier which indeed often changed, but which still was an acknowledged frontier while it lasted. The Bulgarians, in short, as long as their national life lasted, showed themselves in no character but that of the most terrible and determined enemies of the Empire. They were its disciples so far as to become its rivals; but it was only under the mighty hand of Constantine's grandson that they became its subjects.

We may safely say that to the great mass, even of intelligent and well-read Englishmen, Bulgarian history has hitherto been something almost utterly unknown. Some may have learned something about them from Gibbon and Finlay. He must be a careless reader of either of those historians who has not at least carried away the great names of Simeon and Samuel. He may perhaps have smiled at the zeal with which the newly-converted Bulgarian hastened to call his princes after Hebrew patriarchs and prophets; but he can hardly have failed to carry away some remembrance of those princes themselves and their great deeds. Some may even have gone beyond their Gibbon and their Finlay to learn something from the original Byzantine writers themselves. Still this is not Bulgarian history; it is Byzantine history, so far as Byzantine history has been affected by the Bulgarians. But the Bulgarian people have a history of their own, a history in every way worthy of study, and we are glad that we can point to a recent work in which that history can be mastered with pleasure and profit. This is the History of the Bulgarians by Constantine Joseph Jireček.* It is a thorough history of the Bulgarian people at every stage of their national life, save the very last. Published in 1876, but with its preface bearing date in 1875, the work of Jireček was written in time to record the doings of Midhat

* *Geschichte der Bulgaren*, Prag, 1876.

when he reigned alone in Bulgaria. It was not written in time to record those later doings of Midhat and his fellows which have made the world ring with the Bulgarian name. He gives us, in short, all Bulgarian history save the last chapters of all.

We may now mark the steps by which Bulgaria took its definite place among the Christian and Slavonic nations of South-eastern Europe. For two hundred years after their settlement south of the Danube, the Bulgarians, at all events their princes, remained heathens. How far either Christianity or Islam—for Islam too made its way among them*—had been embraced by either their Turanian or their Slavonic subjects it is hard to say. Yet some tinge of Greek culture must have reached them even before the general conversion. A Greek inscription is preserved of the days of the Bulgarian Khan Omortag, who reigned from 815 to 836, a fierce enemy of the Empire, a persecutor of Christian missionaries, but who appears in this inscription as at least a theist. There is no sign of the special teaching either of the Gospel or of the Koran; but Omortag at least calls on a single God, and, if the version of his interpreter be right, he calls on that God for the forgiveness of his sins.† Have we here something answering to the theism of the early Mongols, a theism which might well pave the way either for Christianity or for Islam, which in the one case did pave the way for Islam, and in the other for Christianity? Before the century was

* See Jireček, 134. It should be remembered that the Russian Vladimir also made a deliberate choice between Islam and Christianity.

† This inscription is given by Jireček (148). The latter part runs thus: Το δε ονομα του αρχοντος εστην Ωμορταγ καν. να συ βιβη ο δεος ανοσι αυτον ζισσετ. ν:ρ. We can simply copy Jireček's version, without professing to see every word of the latter part in the original—"und der Name des Fürsten lautet Omortagkan, Gott möge ihm seine Sünden vergeben; lebet wohl." Whatever the inscription may prove as to Omortag's theology, it is almost more precious than the scraps of Greek in Liudprand as a witness to the pronunciation of Greek in those times. If either the Bishop of Cremona or the Bulgarian stone-cutter had known how to spell, we should have lost a great deal of knowledge.

out, Boris was a Christian king of a Christian people. The only question was, whether the new Bulgarian Church should throw in its lot with the Eastern or with the Western side of Christendom.

And now, in the early years of the tenth century, comes one of the great figures in Bulgarian history, one of the figures best worth studying in the history of Eastern Europe, one who would have doubtless found many to study him if he had appeared in another age and in another land. Simeon—the zealous Christian, the learned scholar, as deeply versed in old Hellenic lore as his rival at Byzantium,* but withal the terrible warrior and conqueror, who spread the power of the Bulgarian realm far over Thrace and Macedonia, far over Servia at one end and Albania at the other—stands out as one of those princes to whom we mourn that fate denied an Einhard or an Asser to paint them more in detail. From his capital in Marcianopolis, in his day the Great Peristhlabă,† he ruled over the largest part of the Eastern peninsula, and seemed to place an impenetrable barrier between Byzantium and the outlying lands on the Adriatic. The ruler of such a realm was not satisfied to be a mere barbarian *khan*, a mere Slavonic *kral*. No title was worthy of him but that which was borne by the princes whom he kept, as it were, shut up in the New Rome. First of his race, he bore the imperial name, and handed on the title of *Cæsar*, in its shortened form of *Czar*,‡ to a long line of Bulgarian, Servian, and Russian successors.

Simeon stands by himself in his generation. The scholar-prince who stood beside him, and who, against his will, has

* Liudprand first mentions Simeon in the *Antapodosis* (i. 5): “Simeon fortis bellator Bulgarii praerat, Christianus, sed vicinis Grecis valde inimicus.” Afterwards (iii. 29) he says, “Hunc Simeonem emiargon, id est semigrecum, esse aiebant, eo quod a puericia Bizantii Demostenis rhetoricam Aristotelisque silogismos didicaret.” He adds that he left his secular studies, entered a monastery, and then came out to reign.

† See Jireček, 165.

‡ Jireček (168) undoubtlessly makes *Czar*—in his spelling, *Car*—the Slavonic form of *Cæsar*, a derivation which has been called in question.

become one of his historians, could wield the pen only and not the sword. Two generations later, two mighty forms stand forth together to dispute the dominion of the South-eastern lands. The New Rome has awakened in one of those fits of renewed strength which seemed to bring back the most triumphant ages of the Old. The Caliph trembles on his throne before the approach of Nikêphoros, conqueror of Crete and Antioch; Russian and Bulgarian fall beneath the sword of John Tzimiskës. The Roman frontier again reaches to the Danube, and the capital of Simeon is again a dependency of the older Empire. But far away to the west, in the furthest land to which the Bulgarian power had reached, far away by the lake of Ochrida, a new Bulgarian throne arose. It was the throne of a Bulgarian kingdom which was no longer washed by the Euxine, but which stretched from the Danube southward into Thessaly and Ætolia. The first Bulgaria had been primarily a Moesian realm; the second Bulgaria was primarily a Macedonian realm. Over that realm, from his seat at Ochrida, ruled the Czar Samuel, the hero of his race in that struggle of twenty years which, for Ochrida and Constantinople, ushered in the second millennium of our æra. Equal in strength, in firmness of purpose, in military skill, the lords of the two rival empires, Bulgarian Samuel and Byzantine Basil, held each other for years together in the death-grasp. At last the destiny of Rome prevailed. Ochrida was but for a moment; but Rome, even in her translated seat, was eternal. The realm to which Samuel had given the name of Empire became, as it had been ages before, a province of the true successor of the Cæsars. Basil the Bulgarian-slayer ruled over such a realm as Justinian himself had hardly ruled over. He no longer ruled over Palestine and Egypt, over Sicily and Spain, but he held his own peninsula with a grasp firmer than that of any Emperor since the Goth first crossed the Danube. But it shows the innate vigour of the Bulgarian nation that, even after such utter overthrow, the realm of Simeon and Samuel could rise again. In that new

Bulgaria at its first creation the Rouman might claim his share as well as the Slave; but the Rouman element in the new kingdom seems to have passed away north of the Danube. It was again an essentially Slavonic state which warred with the latter Frank and Greek lords of Constantinople, and which at last fell piecemeal into the jaws of the Turk.

This new Bulgaria of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is perhaps most famous from the overthrow of the first Latin Emperor at the hands of its king. Baldwin in the hands of Joannice fared rather as Valerian at the hands of Sapor than as Rômanos Diogênes at the hands of Alp Arslan. But Joannice founded what was for a while a powerful kingdom. During part of the thirteenth century, under the Czar John Asen the Second, the realm of Tirnovo bade fair to win back the place of the older realms of Peristhlabia and Ochrida. Its prince boasted, truly or falsely, that he reigned on the three seas, and left to the Latin Emperor nothing but the *Czarigrad* itself. But his power was as momentary as that of Samuel, and it fell in pieces without a Basil to crush it. The new Bulgaria was cut short on all sides by Greeks, Servians, and Magyars, and it was a realm split into fragments which stood ready for the Turk to seize after Kossovo. From that time to our own, Bulgaria has been in bondage, a bondage which had known no such alternations of freedom and half-freedom, of momentary transfer to civilized rule, as Servia saw in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and eighteenth centuries. Even when Huniades crossed the Balkan, he restored the freedom of Servia, but he left Bulgaria in bondage. Of all the races under the rule of the Turk, the Bulgarian, whose name was so terrible from the days of Theodoric to the days of the Palaiologoi, has been to all appearance the most submissive. The revival of Bulgarian nationality in our own day is therefore the more wonderful, the more admirable; and small as was the Bulgaria which fell before the Ottoman compared with the Bulgaria which threatened the Eastern Roman, yet the older and greater days of Bulgarian power have left their

mark on the events and on the controversies of our own day. When some were amazed in our own time to hear of Bulgarians in other lands than those between Haemus and Danube, to those who knew the history of those lands the very fact of their amazement was a speaking memory of the days of Simeon and Samuel. When the modern Bulgarian claims Alexander as his countryman, the claim is indeed a wild one ; but it is no wilder than the confusion which makes many an Englishman see a countryman in British Arthur. The realm of Alexander is now largely a Bulgarian land. It is Bulgarian in the sense in which any land is Bulgarian, a Slavonic land which took the name of its Bulgarian masters. And thereby hangs a controversy which, more than any other, darkens the hopes of the regenerate nations of South-eastern Europe. The feelings of race and nationality cut two ways. They have given to both Greek and Bulgarian a national life such as neither of them have had for ages ; but they have turned Greek and Bulgarian into rivals, almost into enemies, in the face of the common enemy of them and of all mankind. It is the story of inland Illyricum and the Dalmatian coast in a more dangerous form. Things have come back to the state in which they were before the establishment of the Roman power. Through a large tract of the lands washed by the *Ægæan* and the Euxine, the Greek holds the coast ; the race which is not Greek holds the mass of inland territory. The two races are geographically intermingled in a way in which the frontier of Briton and Englishman, of Dane and German, give us but a faint idea. But for the moment there is only one lesson to be taught. We would say to the Greek and to the Slave, Let your own disputes be lulled into silence before the great controversy which is laid on both of you. It matters little if this or that Greek district is joined to a Slave state, if this or that Slave district is joined to a Greek state, in face of the great work of delivering both from the common enemy. A day may come, it may be near, when a greater controversy still will have to be decided than drawing a frontier line at this or that distance from

Philippopolis or Thessalonica. The question may soon be asked whether the next Christian prince to be crowned within the church of Justinian shall be a successor of Basil or a successor of Samuel. We will not rule so great a point of controversy; of one thing only we may be sure, that if the mighty men of past time could speak from their graves, Basil and Samuel alike would willingly place his rival on his own throne rather than see the heir of Othman on the throne of Constantinople, with Ochrida and Peristhlabia among the spots from which the cry goes up to heaven for deliverance from his yoke.*

* [I leave this ending as it was written in the first half of 1877; for the warning which it contains is as needful now as it was then. But since those words were written, while Ochrida remains in bondage, Peristhlabia has no need to cry for deliverance. Instead of tributary Roumania and enslaved Bulgaria, a free Roumania and a tributary Bulgaria now appear on the map of Europe. A great work has been done; but that work is still imperfect, and, worse still, much that had been done has been undone. The arms of Russia gave practical freedom to the whole Bulgarian nation. The diplomacy of those who claim to represent England has ruled that that freedom should be taken away again from the greater part of the Bulgarian nation. Northern Bulgaria has become free, saving only a tribute to the Turk. Southern Bulgaria, or part of it, is put into a state of what diplomatists call "administrative autonomy," a phrase whose meaning is not clear, and which one would be glad to see translated into either English or German. It is however defined as a state consistent with the presence of Turkish troops within the province, and of the interference of the Turk in various ways. It needs no proof that, if "autonomy" means "freedom," these conditions are inconsistent with freedom. As yet the Turk has been kept out; unless he is kept out for ever, the "autonomy" will be only on paper. Lastly, south-western Bulgaria is left for the Turk to do what he pleases in without any "autonomy." To say nothing of the sin of throwing men back into bondage who have been already set free, it needs no argument to show that this unnatural division of the Bulgarian nation is in its own nature temporary. No formulæ on earth can make it lasting. All that has been done is this: whereas the work was going to be done at once and peacefully, it will now have to be done at some future time, and that perhaps not peacefully. The only result of the interference of those who profess to speak for England is the creation of an immediate wrong, with a likelihood of future bloodshed.]

With regard to free Bulgaria, even there too wrong has been done. Bulgaria is burthened with a tribute to the Turk, and with a share of

the Turk's debts. Now money paid to the Turk goes to one or other of two purposes. It either goes to keep up the vices and follies of the Sultan's court, or else it goes towards keeping down the nations which are still in bondage. No Christian people ought to be taxed for either purpose. It is specially hard on a people who have suffered so much at the Turk's hands as the Bulgarians have done, that their money should be taken from them, either to pay for the Turk's slave-girls and ironclads, or to pay the wages of European traitors in his service. It is equally unjust to charge Bulgaria with a part of the Turk's debt. This comes of the common confusion of diplomatists, who insist on treating the organized brigandage of the Turk among the nations of South-eastern Europe as if it were a "government" on the same level as European governments. An European government, at least ostensibly, borrows money in the general interests of the inhabitants of the country; it borrows money in short for national purposes. If part of the territory of that government becomes a separate state, or is transferred to another government, it is quite reasonable to transfer to the new government a proportionate part of the debt of the old. But this argument does not apply to the Turk. The Turk does not borrow money in the interests of the people of South-eastern Europe; he borrows it to act against their interests. He does not borrow money for national, but for anti-national, purposes; he borrows it, partly to spend on his own pleasures, partly to spend on the oppression of the subject nations. It seems then hard indeed that a nation which has been set free should be made to take on itself part of the debt which was contracted to supply the means of its former oppression. The Turk borrowed money that he might be better able to oppress Bulgaria; it is a clear wrong that Bulgaria should be made to pay the interest of a debt which was not only not contracted in her interest, but was contracted for the express purpose of doing her wrong.

The interests of "bondholders" are of course not to be thought of. Those who deliberately lend their money for the support of evil must take their punishment when evil ceases to pay.]